



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

re Patent Application of

Bjorn Claesson et al.

Application No.: 09/837,345

Filed: April 19, 2001

For: METHOD FOR THE  
MANUFACTURING OF A CONE  
CUTTER FOR ROTARY DRILLING  
BY CRUSHING A ROTARY CONE  
DRILL BIT, A CONE CUTTER AND  
CRUSHING ELEMENTS  
THEREFOR

) BOX /AF

) Group Art Unit: 3672

) Examiner: Jennifer Hawkins Gay

) Confirmation No.: 7689

RECEIVED  
JUN 17 2004  
GROUP 3600

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 11, 2003, reconsideration of the subject patent application is requested.

The rejection of the claims based upon the combination of the four patents to Scott et al., Yong et al., Drake, and Russell et al. is respectfully traversed.

One of the main purposes of the presently claimed invention is to minimize the amount of material required for making a crushing element used on a rotary cone cutter of a rock crusher. By providing a cone cutter whose crushing elements are welded-on by electric current, the ratio of the H/D dimensions can be less than 1.2, thereby achieving that goal, i.e., there is no need for providing relatively long crusher elements that extend into holes drilled into the base body of the cone cutter (see paragraphs 0003 and 0074 of the application).

In the rejection of the claims, Yong et al. is relied upon as disclosing the claimed ratio H/D. However, the crusher element disclosed in Yong et al. is the same as that of the prior art, i.e., it has a relatively long shank for mounting in a deep hole of the drill bit. That is, the cutter element has a cylindrical grip portion 16 and an extension portion 18, and the grip portion is embedded in the cone cutter (see column 1, lines 46-48 and 57-59; and column 6, lines 25-27). The height mentioned at column 9, lines 15-25 referred to in the Official action merely relates to the "extension height" (column 9, line 21), i.e., the height of the extension portion 18.

Thus, there is no disclosure in Yong et al. of the presently claimed H/D ratio. Rather, Yong et al. teaches the prior art type of cutting element which the presently claimed invention seeks to avoid.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 14, 2004

By: 

Alan E. Kopecki

Registration No. 25,813

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404